



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/798,505

03/11/2004

Keisuke Aoyama

013645.00005

6391

33649

7590

11/17/2009

Mr. Christopher John Rourk

Jackson Walker LLP

901 Main Street, Suite 6000

DALLAS, TX 75202

EXAMINER

MEINICKE DIAZ, SUSANNA M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3684

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/17/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

1 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
2  
3

---

4 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
5 AND INTERFERENCES  
6

---

7  
8 *Ex parte* KEISUKE AOYAMA, KOJIRO TOYOSHIMA, and  
9 YOSHITAKA EZAKI  
10

---

11  
12 Appeal 2009-006755  
13 Application 10/798,505  
14 Technology Center 3600  
15

---

16  
17 Decided: November 17, 2009  
18

---

19  
20 Before MURRIEL E. CRAWFORD, HUBERT C. LORIN, and ANTON W.  
21 FETTING, *Administrative Patent Judges*.  
22 FETTING, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

23  
DECISION ON APPEAL

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Keisuke Aoyama, Kojiro Toyoshima, and Yoshitaka Ezaki (Appellants) seek review under 35 U.S.C. § 134 (2002) of a final rejection of claims 11-14, 21-36, and 38, the only claims pending in the application on appeal.

We have jurisdiction over the appeal pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 6(b) (2002).

SUMMARY OF DECISION<sup>1</sup>

We AFFIRM-IN-PART.

THE INVENTION

The Appellants invented a way of distribution change management that allows a single entity to control distribution through warehouses controlled by multiple entities. (Specification 1:¶ 001).

An understanding of the invention can be derived from a reading of exemplary claims 11 and 26, which are reproduced below [bracketed matter and some paragraphing added].

11. A system for supply chain management comprising:

---

<sup>1</sup> Our decision will make reference to the Appellants' Appeal Brief ("App. Br.," filed February 23, 2007) and Reply Brief ("Reply Br.," filed February 3, 2009), and the Examiner's Answer ("Answer," mailed December 24, 2008).

1 [1] an order controller system  
2 including reverse logistics means for generating transfer  
3 data; and  
4 [2] a warehouse system  
5 receiving the transfer data and generating shipping data.

26. A method for supply chain management comprising:  
 [1] receiving  
     warehouse inventory data and  
     distribution center inventory data and  
     generating reverse logistics data  
     to modify a distribution of inventory at a first warehouse  
     and a second warehouse;  
 [2] receiving the reverse logistics data  
     at a first warehouse system and  
     generating shipping data; and  
 [3] receiving the reverse logistics data  
     at a second warehouse system and  
     generating shipping data.

## 19 THE REJECTIONS

20 The Examiner relies upon the following prior art:

Yang      US 2001/0034673 A1      Oct. 25, 2001

Singh US 2002/0169657 A1 Nov. 14, 2002

21        Claims 26-36 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to  
22        non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 11-14, 21-24, 26, and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as anticipated by Yang.

Claims 25, 27-30, and 32-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yang and Singh.

Claim 38 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yang.

### ARGUMENTS

*Claims 26-36 and 38 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter.*

The Examiner raised this rejection for the first time in the Answer at 3-5, finding that these claims failed the *Bilski* machine or transformation test. The Appellants argue that the claims require the use of data processing equipment and transform the location of inventory. Reply Br. 9-13.

*Claims 11-14, 21-24, 26, and 31 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as anticipated by Yang.*

The Appellants argue several limitations as missing from Yang in claims 11-13, 21-24, 26, and 31. The principal argument regarding independent claims 11 and 26 is with regard to the reverse logistics means and data. App. Br. 11-18.

*Claims 25, 27-30, and 32-36 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yang and Singh.*

*Claim 38 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yang.*

The Appellants argue the Examiner failed to present a prima facie basis for these rejections. App. Br. 18-22).

## ISSUES

The issue of whether the Appellants have sustained their burden of showing that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 26-36 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter turns on whether the claims transform something or are tied to a particular machine or apparatus.

The issue of whether the Appellants have sustained their burden of showing that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 11-14, 21-24, 26, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as anticipated by Yang turns on the construction of reverse logistics means and whether Yang describes the argued limitations.

The issues of whether the Appellants have sustained their burden of showing that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 25, 27-30, and 32-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yang and Singh and in rejecting claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yang turn on the construction of reverse logistics means and whether the claims were predictable to one of ordinary skill in view of the art.

## FACTS PERTINENT TO THE ISSUES

The following enumerated Findings of Fact (FF) are believed to be supported by a preponderance of the evidence.

### *Facts Related to Claim Construction*

01. The disclosure contains no lexicographic definition of “reverse logistics.”

*Facts Related to Appellants’ Disclosure*

02. Figure 8 is a flowchart of a method 800 for reverse logistics in accordance with an exemplary embodiment. Specification ¶ 0088. Figure 8 contains a series of decision boxes each containing a decision of whether to transfer product and if so, transferring control to a box to generate shipping data.

03. There is no structure or algorithm for generating transfer data disclosed in the discussion of Figure 8 at Specification paragraphs’ 0088-93. These paragraphs do discuss generating shipping data, but again without disclosing any structure or algorithm for doing so.

04. The only disclosed apparatus for generating shipment data or for receiving inventory data is a system for supply chain management. Specification ¶ 0006. This shipping data can be generated by order controller systems, warehouse systems and distribution systems. Specification ¶ 0027.

05. The shipping data can be generated based upon order data, order allocation data to warehouses, inventory data, and other suitable data. Specification ¶ 0069. Thus, the basis for generating shipping data is open ended.

*Facts Related to the Prior Art*

*Yang*

- 1           06. Yang is directed to electronic commercial transactions and in  
2           particular to an electronic marketplace providing service parts  
3           inventory planning and management. Yang ¶ 0002.
- 4           07. Yang specifically describes reverse logistics. Yang describes a  
5           growing requirement for many enterprises as the ability to better  
6           manage the "reverse logistics" flow of service parts that are  
7           defective or are otherwise returned for replacement or repair. The  
8           flow of such aftermarket service parts may often provide a  
9           valuable source of re-salable service parts, potentially reducing the  
10          need to purchase or manufacture new service parts. Enterprises  
11          which effectively manage reverse logistics flows can reduce their  
12          costs significantly. Yang ¶ 0004.
- 13          08. Yang uses a parts inventory management system to control  
14          parts inventory at many locations. Parts are transferred among  
15          stocking locations to meet planned inventory needs. Yang's  
16          system receives inventory level data at one or more stocking  
17          locations in a supply chain. Yang ¶ 0007.
- 18          09. Yang's supply chain includes those that use, manufacture,  
19          distribute or sell parts. Yang ¶ 0008.
- 20          10. Yang describes a "reverse logistics" or other returns supply  
21          chain as used for eventual insertion of parts back into a supply  
22          chain. Yang ¶ 0021.
- 23          11. Yang describes how excess inventory and inventory needed to  
24          meet plans can be transferred among inventory stocking locations.  
25          Yang ¶ 0037.



12. Where traceability is important, traceability documents are provided for parts transfers. Yang ¶ 0043.
13. Yang describes maintaining inventories and other information for distribution centers and customer supply chains. Yang ¶ 0036.
14. Yang describes iterating inventory transfers until stocking levels at one or more stocking locations within the supply chain are consistent with the optimal inventory plan. Yang ¶ 0053.
15. Yang describes how an internal distribution network of a supply chain forms an internal warehouse hierarchy. The lower levels of the warehouse hierarchy place demands on higher levels. There is often a need to move inventory between distribution centers within the supply chain to offset needs using excesses. Distribution centers may need to be replenished from outside the internal warehouse hierarchy of distributor if a distribution center at a first level cannot meet the demand from one or more distribution centers at a second higher level. Distribution centers at the second level may need to procure service parts from outside supply chain due to the lack of supply from the distribution center at the first level. A primary difference between reliance on other distribution centers within the supply chain and reliance on such "out-of-network" sources is the lack of visibility into and control over inventory associated with the "out-of-network" sources. Yang ¶ 0019-20.

*Singh*



1 The law in the area of patent-eligible subject matter for process claims  
2 has recently been clarified by the Federal Circuit in, *In re Bilski*, 545 F.3d  
3 943, 950-952 (Fed. Cir. 2008) (en banc), *cert. granted*, 77 USLW 3442  
4 (U.S. Jun. 1, 2009) (NO. 08-964).

5 The en banc court in *Bilski* held that "the machine-or-transformation test,  
6 properly applied, is the governing test for determining patent eligibility of a  
7 process under 101." *Bilski*, 545 F.3d at 956. The court in *Bilski* further held  
8 that "the 'useful, concrete and tangible result' inquiry is inadequate [to  
9 determine whether a claim is patent-eligible under 101.]" *Bilski*, 545 F.3d at  
10 959-60.

11 The court explained the machine-or-transformation test as follows: "A  
12 claimed process is surely patent-eligible under 101 if: (1) it is tied to a  
13 particular machine or apparatus, or (2) it transforms a particular article into a  
14 different state or thing." *Bilski*, 545 F.3d at 954 (citations omitted). The court  
15 explained that "the use of a specific machine or transformation of an article  
16 must impose meaningful limits on the claim's scope to impart patent-  
17 eligibility" and "the involvement of the machine or transformation in the  
18 claimed process must not merely be insignificant extra-solution activity."  
19 *Bilski*, 545 F.3d at 961- 62 (citations omitted). As to the transformation  
20 branch of the inquiry, the court explained that transformation of a particular  
21 article into a different state or thing "must be central to the purpose of the  
22 claimed process." *Id.*

23 *Anticipation*

24 "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the  
25 claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art

reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "When a claim covers several structures or compositions, either generically or as alternatives, the claim is deemed anticipated if any of the structures or compositions within the scope of the claim is known in the prior art." *Brown v. 3M*, 265 F.3d 1349, 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2001). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim, but this is not an *ipsissimis verbis* test, i.e., identity of terminology is not required. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 832 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

#### *Obviousness*

A claimed invention is unpatentable if the differences between it and the prior art are "such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art." *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 406 (2007); *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 13-14 (1966).

In *Graham*, the Court held that that the obviousness analysis is bottomed on several basic factual inquiries: "[ (1) ] the scope and content of the prior art are to be determined; [ (2) ] differences between the prior art and the claims at issue are to be ascertained; and [ (3) ] the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art resolved." *Graham*, 383 U.S. at 17. *See also KSR*, 550 U.S. at 406. "The combination of familiar elements according to known methods is likely to be obvious when it does no more than yield predictable results." *KSR*, 550 U.S. at 416.

ANALYSIS

*Claims 26-36 and 38 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter.*

We apply the machine-or-transformation test, as described in *Bilski*, to determine whether the subject matter of process claims 26-36 and 38 are patent-eligible under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Process claims 26-36 and 38 recite a series of process steps that are not tied in any manner to a machine. In other words, these claims do not limit the process steps to any specific machine or apparatus. Each of the steps receives and generates data. The steps do not recite any machine or algorithm for receiving and generating such data. The Appellants argue that the claims require the use of data processing equipment (Reply Br. 10), but no such equipment is recited in the claims. Thus, the claims fail the first prong of the machine-or-transformation test because they are not tied to a particular machine or apparatus. The steps of these process claims also fail the second prong of the machine-or-transformation test because the data does not represent physical and tangible objects.<sup>2</sup> Rather, the data represents information about inventory, which is an asset category rather than any specific physical item. Inventory data may be no more than item identifiers, which themselves are intangible. Thus, the processes of claims 26-36 and 38 fail the machine-or-transformation test and are not patent-eligible under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

---

<sup>2</sup> Because the data does not represent physical and tangible objects, we need not reach the issue of whether mere calculation of a number based on inputs of other numbers is a sufficient “transformation” of data to render a process patent-eligible under § 101.

*Claims 11-14, 21-24, 26, and 31 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as anticipated by Yang.*

*Claim 11.*

The Appellants argue that Yang fails to describe a reverse logistics means as described by process 800 in the Specification. Claim 11 specifies that the reverse logistic means is for generating transfer data. This limitation is expressed as a means plus function, and the Appellants have confirmed that the limitation is to be construed as such. App. Br. 12-13.

The first step in construing a means-plus-function claim limitation is to define the particular function of the claim limitation. *Budde v. Harley-Davidson, Inc.*, 250 F.3d 1369, 1376 (Fed.Cir.2001). “The court must construe the function of a means-plus-function limitation to include the limitations contained in the claim language, and only those limitations.” *Cardiac Pacemakers, Inc. v. St. Jude Med., Inc.*, 296 F.3d 1106, 1113 (Fed.Cir.2002). [] Ordinary principles of claim construction govern interpretation of this claim language, *see id.*, [].

The next step in construing a means-plus-function claim limitation is to look to the specification and identify the corresponding structure for that function. “Under this second step, ‘structure disclosed in the specification is “corresponding” structure only if the specification or prosecution history clearly links or associates that structure to the function recited in the claim.’ ” *Med. Instrumentation & Diagnostics Corp. v. Elekta AB*, 344 F.3d 1205, 1210 (Fed.Cir.2003) (quoting *B. Braun Med. Inc. v. Abbott Labs.*, 124 F.3d 1419, 1424 (Fed.Cir.1997)).

1 *Golight Inc. v. Wal-Mart Stores Inc.*, 355 F.3d 1327, 1333-34 (Fed. Cir.  
2 2004).

3  
4 The reverse logistics means then must be construed to cover the  
5 corresponding structure, material, or acts described in the specification and  
6 equivalents for performing the recited function, viz. generating transfer data.  
7 The claim does not further narrow the nature of the transfer data, nor the  
8 manner of generation. The Appellants cite the disclosure regarding  
9 reference 800 in Fig. 8 and paragraphs 0088-93 in the Specification as  
10 showing the support for the claimed me Answer App. Br. 7 and 13. We  
11 construe the function of generating transfer data according to its plain  
12 meaning, which is creating data concerned with some transfer.

13 We agree that Fig. 8 portrays an exemplary embodiment of a reverse  
14 logistics method. FF 02. However, the only disclosure related to generating  
15 transfer data is the set of steps labeled as generating shipping data. FF 02 -  
16 03. The disclosed structure for generating shipping data is a system for  
17 supply chain management that might contain order controller, warehouse, or  
18 distribution systems for generating such shipping data. FF 04. Thus the  
19 issue is whether Yang describes such a system for generating shipping data.

20 The Appellants argue that Yang fails to describe receiving warehouse  
21 and distribution inventory data, comparing warehouse and distribution center  
22 data, and determining whether to transfer product as in the Fig. 8 flowchart.  
23 All of these functions argued by the Appellants are beyond generating  
24 transfer data, and thus “are superfluous to our claim construction analysis  
25 because they are not required for performing the claimed function.” *Id.*  
26 While these functions may decide which data to generate, they are separate

1 from the function of generating that data once decided. The flowchart in the  
2 Appellants' Fig. 8 implicitly acknowledges this dichotomy by presenting  
3 the generation in boxes separate from the decisions.

4 The Examiner found that Yang described a reverse logistics process in  
5 an inventory management system. Answer 5. We agree that Yang describes  
6 an inventory management system (FF 08) and a reverse logistics process  
7 with that system (FF 07 & 10). Parts are transferred among locations within  
8 the system according to decisions based on planned needs and actual levels.  
9 FF 08 & 11. One of ordinary skill knew that any inventory management  
10 system that tracked parts at various locations had to document transfers or  
11 shipments among locations. FF 19. Thus, we agree with the Examiner that  
12 Yang described a reverse logistics process in a distribution system that had  
13 structure equivalent to that disclosed in the Specification for generating  
14 transfer data. As this is the only issue argued with regard to claim 11, this is  
15 dispositive.

16 *Claims 12 and 21.*

17 Claim 12 further requires a distribution system receiving the transfer  
18 data and generating shipping data. The Examiner found that Yang's  
19 inventory management system did so. Answer 6. The Appellants argue that  
20 Yang's reverse logistics data is not transfer data. The Appellants first  
21 contend that reverse logistics within the claims is defined as process 800.  
22 App. Br. 13. We do not agree, since the Specification provides no definition  
23 of reverse logistics (FF 01) and the reverse logistics process shown as  
24 reference 800 in Fig. 8 is an exemplary embodiment only. FF 02.



1 The Appellants further contend that the reverse logistics disclosed is  
2 hierarchical where Yang is not and that Yang fails to disclose structure that  
3 facilitates product rollout. App. Br. 13-14. The pertinence of these  
4 arguments is unknown since nothing in claim 12 refers to hierarchical  
5 structures or product rollouts. Thus, we must disagree with the Appellants.

6 Claim 21 is another independent claim that again contains the reverse  
7 logistics means limitation as in claim 11, but whose function also includes  
8 receiving warehouse inventory data and distribution center inventory data.  
9 As with generating data, the structure disclosed for receiving data is a  
10 system for supply chain management that might contain an order controller,  
11 a warehouse, or distribution systems. FF 04. As we found with claim 11,  
12 Yang describes this. The Appellants again argue the absence of a  
13 hierarchical distribution system (App. Br. 14) which is not pertinent in view  
14 of the lack of any claim limitation regarding hierarchy.

15 *Claim 13.*

16 Claim 13 further requires the order controller system having an internal  
17 warehouse order system receiving the shipping data and modifying internal  
18 warehouse order data in response to the shipping data. The Examiner found  
19 that Yang's inventory management system did so. Answer 6. The  
20 Appellants argue that Yang does not describe internal warehouses. App. Br.  
21 14. We do not agree, since Yang describes multiple inventory locations (FF  
22 08) and any inventory location warehouses inventory at that location.

23 *Claims 14 and 22-24.*

24 Claims 14 and 24 further require receiving the shipping data and  
25 modifying inventory data in response to the shipping data. The Examiner

found that Yang's inventory management system did so. Answer 6 & 7. The Appellants repeat their argument that Yang does not describe hierarchical distribution (App. Br. 15-16) which is not pertinent in view of the lack of any claim limitation regarding hierarchy.

*Claims 14 and 22-24.*

Claims 14 and 22-24 further require receiving the shipping data and modifying inventory data in response to the shipping data. The Examiner found that Yang's inventory management system did so. Answer 6-7. The Appellants repeat their argument that Yang does not describe hierarchical distribution (App. Br. 15-16) which is not pertinent in view of the lack of any claim limitation regarding hierarchy.

*Claims 26 and 31.*

The Appellants argue that Yang fails to describe warehouse or distribution center inventory data, two separate generations of shipping data, use of reverse logistics to generate shipping data, or even a warehouse in independent method claim 26. App. Br. 16-17. The Examiner found that Yang's inventory management system did so. Answer 7-8.

The Appellants' arguments appear to rely on two premises: (1) that the reverse logistics data is generated in response to receiving warehouse inventory data and distribution center data and that shipping data is generated in response to reverse logistics data and (2) that Yang fails to describe such transactions at a warehouse, being a long term storage facility.

We agree with the Examiner that the features upon which Appellant relies, viz. the reverse logistics data generated in response to receiving data and shipping data generated in response to reverse logistics data, are not

1 recited in claim 26. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the  
2 specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims.  
3 *See In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 1184-5 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Although  
4 limitation [1] recites receiving warehouse and distribution center data and  
5 generating reverse logistics data, nothing in that limitation recites any causal  
6 connection between the two operations. Similarly, although limitations [2]  
7 and [3] recite receiving reverse logistics data and generating shipping data,  
8 nothing in those limitations recites any causal connection between the two  
9 operations.

10 Clearly any reverse logistics data used by Yang to record receipts of  
11 inventory requires accessing, i.e. receiving inventory quantity data to be  
12 updated, fulfilling limitation [1], and any shipping data used to update  
13 inventory data requires some inventory movement transaction that  
14 necessitated the shipment. This sequence in Yang of receiving the inventory  
15 data prior to generating reverse logistics data also answers the Appellants'  
16 follow up argument that Yang fails to use this sequence. Reply Br. 13. For  
17 those transactions that involved Yang's reverse logistics data, such reverse  
18 logistics data are the transactional records to record that inventory  
19 movement and which necessitate shipping data to record the movement, thus  
20 fulfilling limitations [2] and [3].

21 As to any distinction between a warehouse and a distribution center,  
22 there is none so defined in the Specification. The Appellants cite  
23 Specification ¶ 0056 (App. Br. 17), but this paragraph merely describes an  
24 exemplary embodiment of a distribution system. Certainly, Yang describes  
25 stocking locations (FF 08) used by manufacturers, distribution centers and  
26 customers. FF 07 - 08. Stocking locations at customers, manufacturers and

1 users would generally be considered warehouses, as they warehouse stock at  
2 such locations. Yang also describes distribution centers. FF 13. Yang's  
3 system maintains transactions among various entities including these  
4 stocking locations at customers, users, manufacturers, and distribution  
5 centers. Yang also describes creating multiple shipments among stocking  
6 locations. FF 14. Thus, Yang describes limitation [1] of receiving  
7 warehouse and distribution center inventory data and limitations [2] and [3]  
8 of generating shipping data. In those instances that the transaction involves  
9 parts returns, Yang creates reverse logistics data. FF 07. Although the  
10 Appellants contend the Examiner misconstrued the term reverse logistics  
11 data (App. Br. 16), Yang explicitly recites using reverse logistics that creates  
12 data for updating inventory levels. FF 07. Again, claim 26 recites no  
13 specific connection between the reverse logistics data and the inventory data  
14 and shipping data. Thus, we conclude that the Examiner did not err in  
15 rejecting claim 26.

16 Claim 31 further requires giving priority in maintaining predetermined  
17 inventory levels at a warehouse that is operated by an operator of a supply  
18 chain management system relative to warehouses not so operated. The  
19 Examiner found that Yang uses an internal warehouse and only looks to an  
20 external warehouse when supply is unavailable internally. Answer 8. The  
21 Appellants argue that this does not describe maintaining inventory levels at a  
22 first relative to a second warehouse. Reply Br. 15. The Appellants appear to  
23 be contending that because claim 31 incorporates the two warehouses from  
24 claim 26, an external warehouse is irrelevant to the claim.

25 We agree with the Appellants. Yang's system would not provide reverse  
26 logistics information and create shipping information for a warehouse

outside the system, if only by definition of a system. Thus, we agree with the Appellants that as to this rejection, the inclusion of claim 31 was in error.

*Claims 25, 27-30, and 32-36 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yang and Singh.*

Although the Appellants argue each of these claims individually, the arguments are largely repeated among all these claims. These claims are marked by the introduction of promotional product data, particularly for new product roll outs. The Examiner applied Singh for these limitations. We find that Singh does in fact describe taking new product promotions into consideration for planning inventory levels. FF 17. The Appellants argue that Singh is not directed to supply chain management and that neither reference describes retail locations. App. Br. 18-21. As to whether Singh is directed to supply chain management,

*Claim 38 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yang.*

Claim 38 further requires using regularly scheduled vehicles to transfer inventory. The Examiner took official notice of the practice of using such vehicles. Ans.10-11. The Appellants argue that it is not the use of such vehicles per se that is the key limitation, but rather the limitations of claim 26, from which claim 38 depends. Reply Br. 21. We agree with the Examiner that the use of regularly scheduled vehicles is notoriously well known and was a predictable mode of transport, even for deliveries that were unplanned, because the virtue of regular scheduling is that there will always be a regularly scheduled vehicle available some time after an unplanned need arises. As to claim 26, we found the Appellants' argument unpersuasive *supra*.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Appellants have not sustained their burden of showing that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 26-36 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The Appellants have not sustained their burden of showing that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 11-14, 21-24, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as anticipated by Yang.

The Appellants have sustained their burden of showing that the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as anticipated by Yang.

The Appellants have not sustained their burden of showing that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 25, 27-30, and 32-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yang and Singh.

The Appellants have not sustained their burden of showing that the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yang.

DECISION

To summarize, our decision is as follows.

- The rejection of claims 26-36 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter is sustained.
- The rejection of claims 11-14, 21-24, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as anticipated by Yang is sustained.

- The rejection of claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as anticipated by Yang is not sustained.
- The rejection of claims 25, 27-30, and 32-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yang and Singh is sustained.
- The rejection of claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yang is sustained.

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(1)(iv).

**AFFIRMED-IN-PART**

mev

Address

MR. CHRISTOPHER JOHN ROURK  
JACKSON WALKER LLP  
901 MAIN STREET, SUITE 6000  
DALLAS TX 75202